



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Heydon fixed the minimum wage in Sydney at 8s. 6d. per day for unskilled labor on light work, 8s. 9d. per day for ordinary work, and 9s. per day for heavy work. These amounts were intended to cover not only the bare necessities of life but to allow a share in the prosperity of the community. The outbreak of the war soon wrought decided changes in the cost of living and in December, 1915, the court raised the minimum rate from 8s. 6d. to 8s. 9d. per day. Again in August, 1916, the amount was raised to 9s. 3d. per day.

The New South Wales Arbitration act of 1912, as amended in 1918, made it the duty of the New South Wales Board of Trade to fix the living wage from year to year, after public inquiry. The judge of the Arbitration Court (Heydon) became the president of the Board of Trade. In September, 1918, the board, after taking evidence submitted by employers and employees and hearing the arguments of counsel on both sides, fixed the living wage for Sydney and the industrial suburbs at 10s. a day.

It is the decisions of the Arbitration Court of New South Wales and the findings of the Board of Trade, as well as the briefs submitted by counsel at the last hearing, which have been gathered together and issued as a separate bulletin under the title, *Living Wage (Adult Males)*, 1918. Taken together, they constitute one of the best studies of the minimum wage question as related to the cost of living which has appeared in print. Especially interesting are the reasons advanced by Mr. Justice Heydon for deciding that cost of living as a basis for establishing a living wage cannot, in times of war and uncertainty, be measured in the usual statistical way by taking account of changes in the index numbers showing variations in the prices of certain standard commodities. He had attempted thus to provide for changes in the minimum wage in his decision of 1914, but the war experiences soon demonstrated the impracticability of this mode of procedure at a time when the high cost of living compelled a wide use of substitutes by nearly all classes in the community.

M. B. HAMMOND.

Ohio State University.

Guild Principles in War and Peace. By S. G. HOBSON. (London: G. Bell and Sons. 1918. Pp. viii, 176. 2s. 6d.)

Curiously inadequate attention has been given in this country to the development of the national guild movement in England. This

is perhaps due to the fact that the guild idea—a frank attempt at compromise between syndicalism and state collectivism—did not begin to attract the notice of more than a limited circle of radical intellectuals until chronic industrial interest was quickened into the acute stage by the war, and industrial reconstruction gave certain promise of becoming the salient burning issue as soon as the war should come to an end.

The guild idea has been developed by Mr. A. R. Orage and colleagues in the *New Age* (founded in 1912), by Mr. G. H. D. Cole, and by the author of the little book before us. To the reader unfamiliar with the guild socialists' ideas this can be recommended as perhaps the best brief exposition of the case for national guilds. Mr. Hobson's style is free, vigorous, incisive, and not infrequently bitingly satirical. He writes with insight and something of a Ruskin-like fervor. In such a book the reader must not look for exhaustive analysis or unimpeachable logic. In a sense the book is superficial—it does not dig down and grapple seriously with logical and practical difficulties; in another sense it is far from superficial, for it is written with a depth of feeling and sincerity which suggests the presence of an intuition that may after all probe more directly to fundamentals than could any amount of formal economic logic. Especially in the emphasis of the human element as the "dominant" characteristic of labor, in the reiterated changes rung upon the thesis that labor must not be regarded as a commodity, and in his treatment of the wages system ("wagery" as he picturesquely calls it) as a great obstacle to "mankind's most precious gift," freedom—do we sense this Ruskinesque quality.

Clearing the ground (somewhat) in the first 50 pages for the more constructive and critical later chapters, Mr. Hobson finds the former conservatism and "respectability" of the great trade unions rudely disturbed by the dock strike, the Taff Vale decision, and the advent of the Independent Labor party. In line with guild socialists' disbelief in political action in economic matters, he charges that later representation in Parliament has accomplished nothing essential, while profits for years have been increasing and real wages decreasing.

The only valid line of progress, he thinks, is to change the *status* of labor. Primarily this involves: (1) that labor shall not be regarded as a commodity—something whose purchase and sale is to be left to market competition; (2) that unemployment shall be

made a charge on industry itself, not on the worker or the whole community; and (3) that a real partnership of industry between brain workers and manual toilers must be constituted in joint management of the means of production.

But guild socialism, with its scheme of committees, councils, industrial congress, etc., is not syndicalism. The political state is retained, but divested of all economic function save the ownership of the means of production, which it rents to the guilds (the industrial state) "at a charge measured only by the state's requirements and not the full economic burden which the guilds could bear" (p. 60)—a point of possible interest to single taxers.

The "partnership" of industry must be between a party-of-the-first-part, not definitely named, and the representatives of labor organized into the amalgamated and federated industrial unions which must supersede the present dissociated craft unions. The inquisitive reader may want to know who the other partner is to be—since it is apparent that the capitalist is to disappear. Is it to be the technical men and the managers of the commercial side of the business? The point is not clear. In any case, however, the middle class—the "salarariat," whose real interests lie with the workers, are to be members of the guilds—as is every worker by hand or brain. All who are not are subjects for pathological examination.

The productive possibilities of the new arrangement are touched upon (p. 52). Evidently socialism is regarded as having passed the stage where it need be on the defensive on this point. The guilds are by no means to be regarded as a sort of overgrown co-operative society. Their business will be on a gigantic scale. In a word, they are *national* in scope. In the author's opinion not more than twenty-five would be required. He does not say how he would dispose the workers in ill-defined industries—a difficulty which, by the way, confronts the Whitley plan as well.

Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 10 are marked by ironical criticism of the collectivism represented by Sidney Webb and his followers, and of Whitleyism as represented by the Garton Foundation Memorandum and the Whitley Committee reports. The Garton Foundation cribbed its ideas of industrial councils from guild socialism but its proposals are hollow and futile because they nowhere contemplate the abolition or even any real modification of the wage system—and if there is any one cornerstone of guild philosophy it is that "wagery" must go. The author says:

We ask for genuine reconstruction founded upon the new conception of labor as a sanctified human factor; we get an evasion of the cardinal fact, and are offered workshop control plus an industrial national council, which would not trench upon the functions of Employers' Associations, who are still to profiteer to their hearts' content. . . . The main provisions of the Memorandum are doomed to failure because they deliberately refuse economic democracy. They do worse; they make a pretense of it, ". . . and this is to court not merely a storm of derision but to incite to anger the workers" (pp. 85-87).

The truth of this passage depends, of course, on the attitude of the workers. In any case it is evident that there may be definitions—and definitions—of "economic democracy." The matter is one of the psychology of labor's demands. The practicability or justice of demands is another question.

The weak points, and they are extremely serious, in Mr. Hobson's exposition are common to guild writers. (1) The functions of the political state (which Mr. Cole says is to represent the consumers) are not made clear. One labors with the impression that it will not have much to do, though this feeling is modified somewhat by the passage on "functional free-play" on pages 144-145. (2) The division of powers between the political state and the industrial guilds is very hazy. (3) The author passes over in a spirit almost of levity the problem of adjustment of payment under the guild system. The question of assignment of work he does not touch upon at all. As to payment it appears that everyone, save the old and incapacitated, is to be on monthly or annual salary whether actually employed or not—a proposal in keeping with the tenet that each industry should support its own unemployed. Perhaps there would in that case be fewer unemployed, perhaps not.

A. B. WOLFE.

University of Texas.

The I. W. W. A Study of American Syndicalism. By PAUL FREDERICK BRISSENDEN. (New York: Longmans Green and Company. 1919. Pp. 432. \$4.00.)

An admirable account of a little understood but most important phase of the American labor movement is given in this study. Dr. Brissenden brings out clearly the economic and philosophic background of American syndicalism, and, at the same time, avoids the danger of separating the theory from its application in the field of industry. He is able to do this because he has not de-